This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS

- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES

- FADED TEXT

- ILLEGIBLE TEXT

- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES

- COLORED PHOTOS

- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS

- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problems Mailbox.

Appl. No.: 09/265,489   **Patent**
Amdt. dated: January 7, 2004   Docket No.: 237/116
Reply to Office Action of October 9, 2003

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by

Chandra et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,389, herein after referred to as "Chandra"). Applicants'

respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-44 for the following reasons.

Chandra discloses a message queuing system integrated into a database system, where a

queue is an ordered list of messages and the messages are requests for processing by an

application. A queue table holds a set of queues, and each queue table is implemented as a

database table within the relational database system. Each queue table can contain multiple

queues each having multiple messages. Each row of a queue table represents a message in a

queue of the queue table. Some of the columns in a queue table are meta-data describing the

queue. (Col. 7, Lines 4-12 and Fig. 2) Chandra teaches that each application has a different

view of the same queue, in order that a message can be dequeued and deleted from an

application's view while the same message remains in the queue view of another application.

(Col. 12, Lines 11-16) Thus, in Chandra, multiple views, or copies, of the same queue are

maintained, in order that more than one application can access the same message. Chandra

further teaches that when a message is dequeued by an application, a reference count of the

message stored in the queue table is decremented, and that when the reference count reaches

zero, the message is then either deleted or archived (Col. 20, Lines 40-49).

Claim 1 of the present application recites a "method for managing information to be

accessed by multiple consumers, said information comprising one or more information records,

said information records to be accessed by said multiple consumers in a specified order, each

said information record comprising data to be accessed by a consumer". However, Chandra does

17

Appl. No.: 09/265,489
Amdt. dated: January 7, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 9, 2003

Patent
Docket No.: 237/116

not disclose "information records to be accessed by said multiple consumers in a specified order". Therefore, applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Chandra for at least this reason.

Claim 1 also recites "updating a history table, said history table comprising one or more history records, each said history record comprising a message state field, said updating comprising setting said message state field in a history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data". In Chandra, the dictionary table in col. 31 merely reflects the existence of a queue, and does not have "said message state field in a history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data". Furthermore, the queue table in col. 7, lines 4-6 of Chandra holds a set of queues, where each queue table is implemented as a database table. However, in Chandra, the queue table does not have "said message state field in a history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data". Thus, Chandra does not disclose, teach or suggest the method of claim 1.

Clearly Chandra does not disclose, teach or suggest updating a history table comprising one or more history records where the updating comprises setting a message state field in a history record corresponding to a consumer to indicate the consumer accessed the data. Chandra is not concerned with keeping track of which consumer accessed what data. Thus, Chandra does not disclose, teach or suggest a "a message state field" or "updating a history table, said history table comprising one or more history records, each said history record comprising a message state field, said updating comprising setting said message state field in a history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data," as recited in claim 1. Chandra, therefore, does not disclose, teach or suggest the method recited in claim 1.

18

Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1 and thus, for the same reasons discussed with regard to claim 1, claims 2-12 are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Chandra.

In claim 13 of the present application, the recited "system for delivery of information to multiple consumers" comprises "an information queue comprising one or more information queue records, each said information queue record comprising information to be accessed by one or more consumers". Chandra does not teach, disclose or suggest the "system for delivery of information to multiple consumers" recited in claim 13 as in Chandra, each application, rather than accessing the same queue of messages, maintains its own view, or copy, of the queue of messages. Thus, in Chandra, each application accesses a message from its own individual view, or copy, of the queue. The mechanism of Chandra teaches away from the present invention of claim 13 whose goal, *inter alia*, is to provide a system for delivery of information to multiple consumers that requires a minimum amount of memory to maintain.

Therefore, applicants submit that claim 13 is patentable over Chandra. Given that claims 14-20 and 27 depend from claim 13, applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over Chandra.

Claim 21 recites a "system for the delivery of messages to multiple consumers" comprising "a history table separated from said message queue comprising one or more history records, each of said one or more history records comprising a message identification, a consumer identification and a message state identification". Chandra teaches an Enqueue Options parameter which is a data structure associated with a message that is enqueued. An Enqueue Options parameter for a message stores, *inter alia*, a correlation identifier, which is a value that identifies a message to a user of the system, a recipient list, which identifies

applications or processes to which messages are to be forwarded when dequeued, and a state

parameter that specifies the state of the message at the time of a dequeue operation. (Col. 13,

Line 13 to Col. 15, Line 25) The Enqueue Options parameter for a message does not disclose,

teach or suggest a history table comprising one more history records, each history record

"comprising a message identification, a consumer identification and a message state

identification" as recited in claim 21.

In an Equeue Options parameter, there are no history records each comprising a message

identification; in Chandra, the Enqueue Options parameter has one single correlation identifier.

In an Enqueue Options parameter, there are no history records each comprising a consumer

identification; in Chandra the Enqueue Options parameter comprises a recipient list, which is not

the same as a set of history records each comprising a consumer identification. In an Enqueue

Options parameter, there are no history records each comprising a message state identification; in

Chandra the Enqueue Options parameter has one single state parameter. Moreover, while

Chandra does disclose maintaining a message even after it is dequeued, in order to maintain a

history of what has been done (Col. 19, Lines 28-30), retaining a message to maintain a history

of what has been done does not disclose, teach or suggest a "history table comprising one or

more history records, each of said one or more history records comprising a message

identification, a consumer identification and a message state identification," as recited in claim

21. Thus, claim 21 is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Chandra.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21, and thus, for the same reasons discussed with regard to

claim 21, claim 22 is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Chandra.

20

Claim 23 recites a "method for multiple consumers to access information in a non first-in

first-out, prescribed order, said information comprising one or more pieces of information, a fist

piece of information stored in a first location," the method comprising "providing access to said

first piece of information to a first consumer of said multiple consumers; indicating in a second

location that said first consumer has accessed said first piece of information; providing access to

said first piece of information to a second consumer of said multiple consumers; and indicating

in a third location that said consumer has accessed said first piece of information". As

previously discussed, in Chandra, when a message is dequeued, or otherwise accessed, by an

application, a reference count of the message in the queue table is decremented. (Col. 20, Lines

40-49) Thus, in Chandra, when a first message is accessed by a first consumer (or first

application) and then by a second consumer (or second application), the same reference count is

decremented. Thus, Chandra, does not disclose, teach or suggest a method comprising

"indicating in a second location that said first consumer has accessed said first piece of

information" and "indicating in a third location that said second consumer has accessed said first

piece of information". In discussing claim 23, the Office Action cites Col. 30, Line 30 to Col.

32, Line 60 of Chandra. Applicants respectfully point out that this portion of Chandra is

concerned with creating the queue table in the relational database, and is not concerned with

consumers, or applications, accessing information. For these reasons, Chandra does not disclose,

teach or suggest the invention recited in claim 23.

Given that claims 24-26 and 28-30 depend from claim 23, applicants submit that these

claims are also patentable over Chandra.

Appl. No.: 09/265,489
Amdt. dated: January 7, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 9, 2003

Patent
Docket No.: 237/116

Chandra does not disclose "providing access to said first piece of information to a first consumer of said multiple consumers" as recited in claim 31. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 31 is patentable over Chandra. Given that claims 32-37 depend from claim 31, applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over Chandra.

Chandra does not disclose "means for providing access to said first piece of information to a first consumer of said multiple consumers" as recited in claim 38. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 38 is patentable over Chandra. Given that claims 39-44 depend from claim 38, applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over Chandra.

22

Appl. No.: 09/265,489   Patent
Amdt. dated: January 7, 2004   Docket No.: 237/116
Reply to Office Action of October 9, 2003

CONCLUSION

Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. The Examiner may call the Assignee's

attorney at (650) 849-4422 to further advance prosecution of this case to issuance.

If the Commissioner determines that additional fees are due or that an excess fee has been

paid, the Patent Office is authorized to debit or credit (respectively) Deposit Account No. 50-

2518, billing reference no. OI7011472001.

DATE: January 7, 2004   Respectfully submitted,

                                         By: _____
                                             Jeffrey B. Smith
                                             Registration No. 39,377

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (650) 849-4422
Telefax: (650) 849-4800

23

PA:52124814.1/2021039-7011472001 / OID:1998-15-01